Expiry Date – 23/1

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: AWDM/1866/19 Recommendation – Refuse

Site: 8 Collingwood Court, Shoreham

Proposal: Proposed first floor extension to front (north) elevation.

Neighbours checked: Y

Additional neighbour notifications: N

Date of Site Visit: 10.1

Proposal, Site and Surroundings

This property is a semi detached house at the head of Collingwood Court. This pair is one of 4 identically built pairs in Collingwood Court dating from the early 1970's. As built these semi's have paired central recesses at first floor in their front elevations. Benbow Close, to the west, is a terrace of similarly designed houses.

The application site has recently added a two storey side extension.

These properties are not in a conservation area and are not listed.

This application follows refusal for an identical proposal in July of last year.

Councillor Loader had called this application to committee in the event of a favourable recommendation.

Relevant Planning History

AWDM/0870/19 - Proposed first floor extension to front (north) elevation. Refused 25.7.19

AWDM/0444/17 - Two-storey side extension with first floor front balcony, and single-storey rear extension, infill of ground floor front entrance. Granted 26.7.17

SU/0251/02 - Attached Garage On West Side And Extension To Lounge. Granted 15.1.03

SU/192/89 – Single storey side extension. Granted 6.10.89

SU/533/78 – Extension to side. Granted 16.1.79

Consultations

None undertaken.

Representations

One objection received on behalf of Shoreham Beach Residents Association as follows:

- No different to previous refusal
- Loss of light to No. 7
- Harmful alteration to the appearance of this line of houses.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adur Local Plan 2017 policy 15
'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: No.2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings'
National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Planning Assessment

Principle

The principle of development is acceptable as it extends a family home within the established residential area of Shoreham Beach. The character of Collingwood Court and neighbour amenity are the main issues for consideration.

Character and appearance

Visual amenity

No.8 forms part of a building group which has as an original feature, a first floor front recess. Nos 5 and 6 Collingwood Court have recently added similar extensions to that proposed now. These were built at the same time in accordance with a joint application permission, AWDM/1815/18 refers.

The proposed extension would remove, entirely, this characteristic recess. It would harmfully unbalance the appearance of this pair of houses and consequently the appearance of the streetscene of Collingwood Court. It is contrary to policy 15 of the adopted Adur Local Plan which states:

Development should be of a high architectural quality and respect and enhance the character of the site, and the prevailing character of the area, in terms of proportion, form, context, massing, siting, layout, density, height, size, scale, materials, detailed design features and landscaping. Development should:

- Enhance the local environment by way of its appearance and character, with particular attention being paid to the architectural form, height, materials, density, scale, orientation, landscaping and layout of the development;
- Make a positive contribution to the sense of place, local character and distinctiveness of an area;

Development Management Standard No. 2 ‘Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings’ also states:

THE APPEARANCE

The most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and street scene generally. In particular, the proposal should not be allowed to over-dominate the house or clash with its appearance.

2.6 The following principles should also help to ensure that the criteria discussed above are met:-
(a) Extensions should respect the architectural period and style of the existing dwelling and the area.

This is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 which states;

Para *122* -

Planning policies and decisions should support development that makes efficient use of land, taking into account:

d) the desirability of maintaining an area’s prevailing character and setting

Para 127.

Planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments:

a) will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;

b) are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping;

c) are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting,

d) establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live, work and visit;

The proposal does not respect local character. It is contrary to local plan policy and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The deep front recesses are an integral feature of the original design of these houses. The 2017 permission at this address initially also included a proposal to extend as proposed now. This was negotiated out of that permission. Also in 2017 an application for a similar extension at No. 6 Collingwood Court was refused on the grounds that it would harm the character and local distinctiveness of these houses. In February of 2019 a joint application for 5 and 6 to extend as proposed now, was approved, AWDM/1815/18 refers. A condition was attached that they be completed as one development. This development is built.

To extend No. 8 as now proposed will harmfully unbalance this pair of houses, 7 and 8, and remove an integral part of their original design. This would be harmful to visual amenity. A joint application with a condition that they be completed together is likely to be favourably considered.

Residential amenity

No. 7 has a recessed bathroom window and a lantern light over the porch. Light to such rooms is less protected. Not all light to either will be lost as a result of this proposal.

Recommendation - REFUSE for the following reason:

The proposal by reason of its size, siting and design would appear alien and discordant and harmfully unbalance this pair of houses. As a consequence the development would be harmful to the cohesive townscape and local distinctiveness. As such it is contrary to Local Plan policy 15, Development Management Standard No. 2 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Informative

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to meet with the Applicant to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

Is recommendation contrary to any representations? No.

Case Officer signed:	MOK	Date: 10.1.20
Authorised and signed by:	Peter Barnett	Date: 10 January 2020